

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05268 010220Z

13

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 DRC-01 H-03 ACDA-19 IO-14 OIC-04

AEC-11 OMB-01 /164 W

----- 130249

R 312255Z OCT 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2470

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3417

USMISSION BERLIN

S E C R E T USNATO 5268

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NEGOTIATED INSPECTION MEASURES: OCT. 31 SPC DISCUSSION

REF: USNATO 5226

SUMMARY: SPC REACHED AGREEMENT ON AN INTITIAL LIST OF QUESTIONS IN POLITICAL AND MILITARY FIELD RELATED TO INSPECTION MEASURES. UK URGED THAT ALLIES ADDRESS POLITICAL QUESTIONS AT EARLY DATE, IN ORDER TO HELP ALLIED NEGOTIATORS IN VIENNA TO RESPOND TO INEVITABLE PACT QUERIES. BELGIUM PROPOSED SOME SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO U.S. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE BY NOVEMBER 5 SPC MEETING ON QUESTIONS IN PARAS 2 AND 3 BELOW AND ON FRG QUESTION (REFTEL) ON ALLIED ACCESS TO INFORMATION OBTAINED BY NATIONAL INSPECTION MEANS. END SUMMARY.

1. UK REP LOGAN NOTED THAT TIMETABLE IN VIENNA IS DEVELOPING QUICKLY, AND ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE NOW WORKING ON THEIR PRESENTATIONS OUTLINING IN GREATER DETAIL THE THEMES CONTAINED IN OPENING STATEMENTS. LOGAN ANTICIPATED THAT ALLIES WILL BEGIN TO GET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05268 010220Z

QUESTIONS WITHIN TWO WEEKS FROM WARSAW PACT ON INSPECTION MEASURES. HE URGED THAT ALLIES GET EARLY AGREEMENT ON SOME BASIC POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

2. ON BASIS OF QUESTIONS POSED BY UK AND OTHERS, SPC ACTING CHAIRMAN HAAS SUGGESTED FOLLOWING LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION IN NATO:

A. POLITICAL (INITIAL EXAMINATION IN SPC)

(1) HOW STRONGLY DO THE ALLIES REALLY FAVOUR EFFECTIVE AND DETAILED ADVERSARY INSPECTION? SHOULD NATO FOREGO A DEGREE OF VERIFIABILITY IN ORDER TO STRUCTURE ITS OWN REDUCTIONS IN A WAY LEAST DAMAGING TO ITS MILITARY CAPABILITIES? (MBFR WG MAY ALSO COMMENT ON THIS POINT)

(2) FROM POLITICAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS POINTS OF VIEW, HOW IMPORTANT IS IT TO NEGOTIATE AT LEAST SOME KIND OF OVERT INSPECTION SCHEME?

(3) SHOULD THERE BE VERIFICATION STEPS BEFORE REDUCTIONS, I.E. OF CURRENT FORCE LEVELS?

(4) COULD CERTAIN VERIFICATION MEASURES BE ENVISAGED AS APPLYING OUTSIDE OF NGA AS WELL AS INSIDE NGA?

(5) IS AN OPEN-SKIES PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE TO ALLIES?

(6) WHAT ARRANGEMENTS DO ALLIES ENVISAGE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL OF VERIFICATION AGREEMENTS?

(7) WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF MILITARY ATTACHES AND MILITARY LIAISON MISSIONS?

B. MILITARY (INITIAL EXAMINATION BY MBFR WORKING GROUP)

(1) TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD WARSAW PACT VERIFICATION ACTIVITY ON OR OVER ALLIED TERRITORY ACTUALLY INHIBIT NATO FROM STRUCTURING ITS OWN REDUCTIONS IN A WAY LEAST DAMAGING TO ITS MILITARY CAPABILITIES?

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05268 010220Z

(2) WHAT LOSS OF TECHNOLOGY OR CLASSIFIED OPERATIONAL INFORMATION, IF ANY, WILL OCCUR AS A RESULT OF ANY PROPOSED VERIFICATION MEASURES?

(3) WHAT GAINS IN INFORMATION ON WARSAW PACT FORCES COULD BE ACHIEVED THROUGH ANY OF THE PROPOSED VERIFICATION MEASURES?

(4) WILL ANY RESULTING DISADVANTAGES FROM VERIFICATION BE EQUAL IN THEIR EFFECTS ON BOTH SIDES?

(5) WORKING GROUP SHOULD ATTEMPT TO RECONCILE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN U.S. OCTOBER 5 PAPER AND PREVIOUS WORKING GROUP

STUDIES ON LIKELY MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR VARIOUS  
INSPECTION SYSTEMS.

(NOTE: SPC ASKED WORKING GROUP TO GIVE PROMPT STUDY TO  
FOREGOING QUESTIONS. WORKING GROUP COULD EXAMINE THE  
FOLLOWING QUESTION AT A MORE DELIBERATE PACE.)

(6) EXAMINE THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL PROS AND CONS OF  
EACH OF THE MEASURES CONTAINED IN THE U.S. PAPER. ALSO  
EXAMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF EACH MEASURE, E.G. AVAIL-  
ABILITY OF APPROPRIATE EQUIPMENT AND TRAINED MANPOWER.

3. BELGIAN REP ALSO ADDRESSED FOLLOWING SPECIFIC QUESTIONS  
TO U.S.:

WHAT IS IT PRECISELY WHICH THE U.S. DESIRES WHEN IT  
CALLS FOR NON-INTERFERENCE WITH NATIONAL MEANS? WHAT  
TYPE OF INTERFERENCE DOES U.S. WISH TO REMOVE? HOW  
SERIOUS IS THIS INTERFERENCE, PARTICULARLY IN LIGHT OF  
EMPHASIS WHICH U.S. HAS PLACED ON NEED TO RELY ON NATIONAL  
MEANS? DOES U.S. ENVISAGE AGREEMENT ON NON-INTERFERENCE  
AS AN ADJUNCT TO A REDUCTIONS AGREEMENT?

4. SPC AND MBFR WORKING GROUP WILL BEGIN TO ADDRESS THESE  
QUESTIONS EARLY NEXT WEEK. SPC WILL ALSO CONSIDER  
THE FORMAT FOR AN EVENTUAL REPORT OR REPORTS TO THE COUNCIL ON  
NEGOTIATED INSPECTION MEASURES.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05268 010220Z

MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 31 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05268  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731064/abqcecy.tel  
**Line Count:** 143  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** USNATO 5226  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <26-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: NEGOTIATED INSPECTION MEASURES: OCT. 31 SPC DISCUS- SION  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
BERLIN  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005